

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner John Lee for granting and conducting a telephone interview on February 20, 2008 in connection with the above-identified application. In the Interview Summary Sheet, the Examiner states that the “digital zoom function” of the Kodak reference teaches the cropping features of the claimed invention.

Based on the above-mentioned interview, independent claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended to further define the “cropping” limitation recited therein and to overcome the references cited by the Examiner.

Independent claims 1, 5, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kodak DC240/DC280 in view of Park (U.S. 5,231,440) and further in view of Takahashi (U.S. 2003/0133034). Further, dependent claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kodak in view of Park and further in view of Takahashi and Imaizumi et al. (U.S. 6,236,389). These rejections are believed inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 5, and 9 and claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 which depend therefrom for the reasons discussed below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including a cropping means for (1) receiving a photographed image and generating a cropped image by cutting off at least a top portion and a bottom portion of the received photographed image such that a vertical line count and a horizontal line count of the received photographed image are not compressed, and the vertical line count and the horizontal line count of the cropped image matches the vertical line count and the horizontal line count of the television format. The apparatus of claim 1 also includes a compression means for (2) receiving the same (i.e., un-cropped) photographed image, generating a compressed image. In addition, the apparatus of claim 1 includes a switching means for (3) selecting the generated cropped image or selecting the generated compressed image, the selected image being enlarged by an enlargement means. The Kodak, Park, Takahashi, and Imaizumi references, or any combination thereof, fail to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features (1)-(3), as recited in independent claim 1.

As mentioned above, the Examiner relies on Kodak for teaching the cropping means recited in claim 1. However, Kodak merely teaches the use of a “3X Digital zoom” by the lens when taking a picture (see last two pages of Kodak).

Thus, it is apparent that Kodak teaches the use of a digital zoom at the time of taking a picture, but does not disclose or suggest receiving an already photographed image and generating a cropped image of the already photographed image, as required by claim 1.

Further, it is clear that Kodak fails to disclose or suggest that the cropped image is generated by cutting off at least a top portion and a bottom portion of the received photographed image such that a vertical line count and a horizontal line count of the received photographed image are not compressed, and the vertical line count and the horizontal line count of the cropped image matches the vertical line count and the horizontal line count of the television format, as required by amended independent claim 1.

In addition, as stated in the Office Action of September 13, 2007, the Examiner relies on Takahashi for teaching the compression means and the switching means recited in claim 1. However, Takahashi teaches a compression circuit 29 which has the ability to apply multiple compression modes to a received signal, the appropriate compression mode being selected by a compression selection circuit 30 (see paragraphs [0067], [0068] and [0070]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Takahashi teaches that the compression selection circuit selects a compression mode to be implemented, but does not disclose or suggest a switching means for selecting the cropped image generated from a photograph or selecting the compressed image generated from the (same) photograph, as required by claim 1.

In other words, Takahashi’s disclosure of selecting a single compression mode from a plurality of compression modes and only compressing the received signal according to the selected compression mode is not a disclosure or suggestion of cropping a photograph, compressing the (un-cropped) photograph, and then selecting between the cropped and compressed photograph, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is clear that any obvious combination of the digital zoom disclosed by Kodak and the compression circuit disclosed by Takahashi would not result in the invention of amended independent claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kodak, Park, and Takahashi or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kodak, Park, and Takahashi to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2 and 3 which depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.


Further, the Imaizumi reference was cited for teaching the features of dependent claims 2 and 3 in the above-mentioned 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection. However, Imaizumi also fails to disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from Kodak, Park, and Takahashi. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is clear that Imaizumi in combination with Kodak, Park, and Takahashi do not disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1 and claims 2 and 3 which depend therefrom.

Independent claims 5 and 9 recite an image enlarging method and an image enlarging apparatus, respectively, wherein the method and apparatus of claims 5 and 9 include limitations which correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features recited in independent claim 1 (e.g., cropping, compressing, and selecting). Thus, for reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5-7 and 9-11 are allowable over Kodak, Park, Takahashi, and Imaizumi.

In view of the above remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Toshiro MIYAZAKI

By: 
Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 13, 2008